

REMARKS

Claims 1-53 are pending in this Application. The Final Office Action mailed December 9, 2003, has rejected Claims 1-53. Claims 3, 4, 13, 33, 37, 49, and 53 were objected to. In response, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 33, 37, 49, and 53 to further clarify the patentable subject matter of the claimed invention. No Claims have been cancelled. No new matter has been added by any of these amendments. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record.

Objections to Claims:

The Final Office Action has objected to Claims 3, 4, 13, 33, 37, 49, and 53 for informalities. The claims have been amended to correct the informalities. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 3, 4, 13, 33, 37, 49, and 53 are now in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-17, 19-30, 37, 39, 48, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Paragraph 4 of the Final Office Action has rejected Claims 1-3, 5-16, 19-30, 37, 39, 48, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,021,412 to Ho et al. (hereinafter "Ho") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,674 to Murakami et al. (hereinafter "Murakami"). Furthermore, Paragraph 7 of the Final Office Action has rejected Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho in view of Baru et al. ("XML Based Information Mediation for Digital Libraries."). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art reference does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Amended Claim 1 recites a method for searching a database to obtain an object that is related to an indicated object in a document, comprising, inter alia, automatically creating a query directly from the indicated object, the query having a data structure that is recognizable by a search engine for the database, wherein the query is created by selecting a nearest word to the indicated without having a user make a selection for the query in a separate document. The Claim is supported by the Specification. See Specification, Page 9, lines 1-3.

As discussed above, Ho's method requires a user to select a word from the list of concept matching words already associated with stored images to create a query. See Ho, Col. 3, lines 46-48. Murakami discloses an iterative image selection method, that focuses on entered word or character strings to present the user with images to select. See Murakami, Figs. 3, 10A, and 17. Thus, neither Ho, nor Murakami disclose or suggest enabling an automatic creation of a query directly from the indicated text, the query having a data structure that is recognizable by a search engine for the database, wherein the indicated text comprises a selection by a user from a predetermined number of words determined for their proximity to an indicated object and the query is created without having the user make a selection for the query in a separate document. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1 and 5 are in condition for allowance.

In addition, amended Claims 48 and 50 include automatic creation of a query from an indicated text, wherein the indicated text comprises a selection by a user from a predetermined number of words determined for their proximity to an indicated object and the query is created without having the user make a selection for the query in a separate document. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 48 and 50 are also in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Claims 2, 3 depend from amended Claim 1, and Claims 6-17, 19-30, 37, and 39 depend from amended Claim 5, respectively, and are allowable for at least the reasons listed above for amended independent Claims 1 and 5, respectfully.

Rejection of Claims 4, 18, 31-36, 38, 40-47, 49, and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Paragraph 5 of the Final Office Action has rejected Claims 4, 18, 31-36, 38, 40-47, 49, and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho and Murakami in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,493,677 to Balogh et al. (hereinafter "Balogh"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art reference does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. As discussed above, neither Ho, nor Murakami disclose or


obvious by Ho in view of Balogh. Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 51 and its dependent Claims 52 and 53 are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has addressed fully all of the concerns expressed in the Final Office Action, and believe that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Entry of the amendments and early favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is urged. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: February 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Jamie L. Wiegand
Registration No.: 52,361
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(206) 262-8915
(212) 753-6237 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant